

REMARKS

The present claim amendments are responsive to the Examiner's concerns noted in the Office Action.

Summary of the Response

Claims 96, 104, 107, 136, 139, 140, 142, 143 and 144 have been amended. Claims 99-102, 114, 117-129 and 135 have been previously withdrawn. Claims 96-98, 103, 104, 106-113, 115, 116, 130-134 and 136-145 remain pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the present application as amended are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 96 and 136-145 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai et al (5,647,042, cited in previous office action) in view of Lessar et al (5,902,326, cited in previous action). Claims 96-98, 103-104, 106-111, 115 and 130-134 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Karlovich (5,037,328, cited in previous office action). Claims 112 and 113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karlovich. These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the claims as amended.

Traversal of The Rejections

It becomes clear from the Examiner's rejections that the combination of Ochiai and Lessar have not been applied to claims that recites a ferrule comprising a first ferrule half and a second ferrule half (e.g., claim 104), and Karlovich has not been applied to claims that recite an optical fiber (e.g., claim 136). While Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's rejections, in view of the clear indication of patentable subject matter given by the rejections (i.e., the combination of an optical fiber and a first ferrule half and a second ferrule half), Applicant amended all independent claims to recite a first ferrule half and a second ferrule half, so as to distinguish from Ochiai and Lessar in a manner acceptable to the Examiner, and further amended independent claims 96 to positively recite an optical fiber, so as to distinguish Karlovich in a manner acceptable to the Examiner. The rejections are believed to be traversed by such amendments. Applicant reserves the right to file a continuation of the subject matter canceled as a result of such amendments.


Should the Examiner raise new prior art and/or new grounds of rejection in the next action, such action should not be made final, since the claim amendments herein are well within the Examiner's scope of search (as the Examiner is obligated to extend the scope of search to subject matter that could be reasonably claimed in light of the specification).

CONCLUSION

In view of all the foregoing, Applicant submits that the claims pending in this application are patentable over the references of record and are in condition for allowance. Such action at an early date is earnestly solicited. **The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative to discuss any outstanding issues that may not have been adequately addressed in this response.**

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 23, 2006



Wen Liu
Registration No. 32,822

LIU & LIU
444 S. Flower Street; Suite 1750
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 830-5743
Facsimile: (213) 830-5741
Email: wliu@liulaw.com